Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

one expects to read the title ṣâbit appâte, which is literally "holder of the reins." This official was properly the "chariot-driver." But Professor Sayce, on p. 80, renders the title "bear-hunter." Is it possible he reads LU as dip and connects dippa with dabû, "a bear"? One almost feels ashamed to suggest the idea, but suspicion is not easily allayed.

C. H. W. JOHNS.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE,
Cambridge.

---

## EARLY BABYLONIAN HISTORY.[1]

This book is the outgrowth of a doctor's dissertation presented to Columbia University in April, 1898. In adding this to the many discussions of this period which have appeared within the last fifteen years, the author has the following points especially in view: (1) "To arrange as far as possible the kings of the different dynasties so far as known to us according to a certain chronological order." (2) To transcribe and translate—where possible—all texts not found in *KB.*, III, 1. "By doing this I thought to help not only the historian, but also beginners in the study of Sumerian inscriptions, of whom I am first and foremost." In this he acknowledges his indebtedness mainly to the works of Jensen, Hilprecht, and Thureau-Dangin; also to Brünnow and Delitzsch. (3) To cite under the discussion of each king all the known, published literature of that ruler. (4) To presume some knowledge of the grammar of the "Sumerian language" by the reader of the volume. (5) "To avoid deductions from the inscriptions as far as possible," for each reader can do this for himself. (6) "To avoid all legendary matter." The preface also contains a note, which would much better have been added at an appropriate place in the book, on the pronunciation of Šir-pur-la-$^{ki}$ as found in the short form in Gudea Cyl. B, v, 22, where we find Šir-pur-$^{ki}$. From this single example he says: "Hence this much only can we say: the sign for Pur had in all probability also the value of Pul."

The general plan of the book may be indicated before we examine its parts in detail. The introduction is an elaborate discussion (in 43 pages) of the chronology of this period of history, with an arrangement of the rulers of each city and dynasty. This is followed in succession by a treatment of the "Lord of Kengi" (4 pp.), "Rulers of Shirpurla" (75 pp.), "Kings of Kish and Gishban" (29 pp.), "The First Dynasty of Ur" (3 pp.), "The Patesis between Lummadur and Ur-Ba'u" (1 p.), "Kings of Agade" (21 pp.), "The Kings of Guti and Lulubi" (5 pp.), "The so-called Later Patesis of Shirpurla" (34 pp.), "The Second Dynasty of Ur" (10 pp.), "Kings of Erech" (3 pp.), "Kings of Isin"

[1] EARLY BABYLONIAN HISTORY: down to the End of the Fourth Dynasty of Ur; to which is appended an account of "The E. A. Hoffman Collection" of Babylonian Tablets in the General Theological Seminary, New York, U. S. A. By Rev. Hugo Radau, A.M., B.D., Ph.D., Mayo Fellow in the General Theological Seminary. New York: *Oxford University Press*, 1900. xx + 452 pp.

(6 pp.), "The Third Dynasty of Ur" (3 pp.), "The Fourth Dynasty of Ur" (49 pp.), "The Names of the Months" (20 pp.), "Sign, 'God,' before Certain Proper Names" (10 pp.). To these are added 15 pages as an appendix on the E. A. Hoffman collection and indices containing "Proper Names," "List of Gods," "Buildings," "Cities and Lands" (18 pp.).

The discussions of the chapter headings just indicated are accompanied by the transliteration and translation, and, in case of the E. A. Hoffman collection, in many cases of a facsimile of the original text. Altogether we find about 250 different texts, large and small, treated in this volume. It is manifestly impossible to review such a display in the space at our command. It is of larger importance for our knowledge of early Babylonian history to ascertain the use made of all this material by the author. The introduction is the key to the author's method of chronology and classification, so let us turn our attention to this basal chapter.

The author begins his work by touching the "Sumerian" question. "Since Hammurabi wrote his records in two different languages, we are led to believe there were two different peoples in the land, differing from each other in speech." These have been called by scholars "Sumerian" and "Semitic-Babylonian." "An examination of them shows that the Sumerian was the original one in old Babylonia." "The Sumerians must consequently have been the people who invented this system of writing, called the 'cuneiform script.' If this is so—and it can hardly be denied—it would follow that there must have been a time when the Sumerians were the sole possessors of Babylonia. And if the Sumerians were the originators of this system of cuneiform writing and the original inhabitants of Babylonia, the question arises, When did the 'barbarians,' who adopted the Sumerian mode of writing in order to express their Semitic language, invade the country?" "If," as is done by some scholars, "we postulate only one race, using two different 'modes of writing,' how well educated must the people have been at so early a time as 4000 B. C. to be *able* to *use* two such widely differing 'modes of writing'! That would presuppose a development of at least two to three thousand years and a civilization which would be without parallel in the history of mankind." These assertions and conclusions in the outset of the book are discouraging. They reveal to the reader rather a hypothetical than a real basis in fact.

After settling the "Sumerian" question as indicated above, we find that "the most difficult question, however, in this history is that of its *chronology*. Here we have almost no basis to stand on." In these straits we can resort to two methods for locating our ancient rulers: "(1) By incidental references to kings who are thus shown to be contemporaries; (2) by palæographic evidence where the former is wanting." These two principles for the establishment of a system of early Babylonian chronology are both uncertain and precarious. As an example of the first principle he reproduces (p. 7) from *Revue d'Assyr.*,

Vol. IV, pp. 1 *sq.*, two seal-cylinder inscriptions of Sargon I. and Naram-Sin, respectively, wherein Lugalušumgal[2] is mentioned as patesi of Širpurla. But the second inscription is badly mutilated, and the parts supplied, though Radau's copy does not indicate that anything is lacking in the original, may be correct or incorrect. If they are correct, it is entirely possible that there may have been more than one Lugalušumgal patesi of Širpurla, as there were several rulers of Ur by the name of Dungi. At any rate, we must have a firmer basis than this for a trustworthy chronology.

In the second place, Radau takes twelve common signs: KUR, KA, MU, ŠU, DA, E, A, DAM, ḪUL, LUGAL, SUM, and KUŠ, and arranges in his supposed order of development the oldest forms of these signs found previous to and in Ur-Ba'u's time. He heads the list with two forms from the Monument Blau, "confessedly the oldest document we possess" (p. 9). In his classification of the oldest documents on the ground of the evidence of palæography he says: "The *first period* apparently is governed by the peculiar sign for MU" (p. 9). "The *second period* is governed by the signs DA and ŠU" (p. 9). "The *third period*, beginning with Lugalzaggisi, is governed by the peculiarity that original curved lines are broken (*cf.* ĠUL), complete lines are divided (*cf.* E), the 'thumb' in DA and ŠU is straightened, the sign for 'king' no longer exhibits its original two elements, but they form *one* sign." Sargon I. belongs to this last period. And to these three periods are attributed, on the basis of the peculiarities of one or more signs, all the archaic inscriptions previous to and including Sargon I.

Now the dates and comparative lengths of these periods must be considered. The author says (p. 11): "If we claim for each period a space of only 500 years—which is surely not exorbitant—we would come to the great age of about 5000 B. C. We may safely assert that the difference of the signs on the Monument Blau from those in *RA.*, III, 1–7 [this should be *RA.*, IV, 3, Nos. 1–7] is so great that we may add about 500 years more, *i. e.*, 5500 B. C., which would be the approximate date of the Monument Blau." This is the method by which the author establishes the periods in early Babylonian history, and on these as a basis he proceeds to examine the available documents. He begins by an examination of the documents that are necessary to establish the chronology of the kings and patesis of Širpurla (Lagaš).

"Having seen that Urukagina must have preceded Eannatum" (p. 12) —based on palæographic evidence only—he turns to the documents of this "king" and "patesi" of Širpurla. The fourth document given is not found in de Sarzec's *Découvertes*, 31, 3, as cited, nor in *RA.*, II, p. 87, but in *RA.*, II, p. 82.[3] On p. 14 an inscription is quoted from *RA.*, III, p. 31, to prove that "Enannatum I. was a son of Akurgal, and therefore

[2] Radau, in both transliterations and in other places in the volume, erroneously writes Ušum-gal for Ušumgal.

[3] In the discussion of this document in *RA.* M. Heuzey makes comparison with *Déc.*, 31, 3, which is translated by Oppert in *RA.*, II, p. 87; hence the confusion of references, neither of which is correct in Radau, p. 13.

a brother of Eannatum." But in the inscription copied the very word which he says "proves clearly" his case is not found in this text. The *dumu* is inserted before the name A-kur-gal. On p. 15 he says: "Each period, it was argued, comprised about 500 years." The only "argument" concerning the length of the period previous to this statement is the assumption quoted above. Again on p. 17 he says: "We might be able to fill up the 500 years which were claimed to lie between Urukagina and Lugalzaggisi, especially if we allow for every king about twenty years, and for the lacunæ which exist between certain kings some twenty to fifty years. The succession of governors during these 500 years would then be" (as follows). This is, indeed, a novel method of constructing history, and one which will severely shake the confidence of Radau's readers. On p. 21, in endeavoring to establish the conclusion of the patesis of Širpurla, he "proves clearly" that, because Ġalalama's[4] name is not followed by patesi, his father was the last patesi of that city, and his immediate successor was a King Ur—a large deduction from a simple omission.

Radau adopts the date of Naram-Sin (3750 B. C.) and Sargon I. as given in the inscription of Nabonidus. In this he disagrees with E. Meyer, Thureau-Dangin, and Lehmann. In fact, his whole chronological theory is built up on the assumption of the truthfulness of Nabonidus' statement. A few other statements must conclude our notice of his introduction. On p. 39 he says: "Between Ur-Ba'u and Gudea we claimed a space of about 200 years, on account of palæographic evidence—the sign for KA shows that clearly. Thus it will be seen that our arrangement is *true* to the present state of science, claiming 'gaps' where we do not know the succession of rulers, and palæography enjoins us to do so. If we bear this in mind, we are fully justified in assigning for the space between Ur-Ba'u and (Ga)lukani about 350 years." Again on p. 40, in the discussion of the relations of Gungunu and Dungi III., we discover a marvelous statement from the pen of our historian: "Again, we do not know that Dungi III. was the son of Gungunu; thus we are forced by necessity—if we wish to be scientific—to claim another gap between these two rulers; and since their titles are so very different, it follows that this gap must be a considerable one; . . . . [this] is reason enough to claim for this gap 100 years."

Radau's summary of his chronology (p. 42), hovering about 3750 B. C., is a good exposition of the uncertainties with which everyone who takes up early Babylonian history in its present status must deal. This introduction reveals the fact that we are not yet ready to deal seriously with the chronological problems of the early Babylonian periods. The inscriptions are fragmentary, disconnected, ambiguous, and far from yielding material that will give us an early solution of these problems. Lehmann's, Hilprecht's, and Radau's attempts to construct a chronology

[4] The sign read *Ġa* or *Ḫa* is not only doubtful, as noted by Jensen (*KB.*, III, 1, p. 70, n. 6), but is most probably to be read *sig* or *pik*. The same sign occurs in Gudea Cyl. A, iv, 18, and Stat. B, v, 26.

for the whole period should be regarded *merely as assumptions.* To wrangle over dates in such an uncertain period is merely to juggle with figures, and waste time that would far better be employed in publishing or deciphering inscriptions belonging to this early period, until we have enough material to avoid the "scientific" method adopted by Radau, as indicated in the above quotations. The historian should make use of all the material at hand, but as soon as he enters the field of pure assumption he ceases to command the confidence of his readers, and to support the dignity of the science he serves.

On the basis of the chronology thus laid down, Radau proceeds to present the transliteration and translation of most of the inscriptions touching the rulers indicated in the chapter headings above. In carefully examining this great mass of literature, we find very few which have not been published before, either in translation, or in transliteration and translation. The author has suggested a few improvements, but the repetition of the inscriptions in these pages finds its justification rather in their bearing on the history than in the amount of new philological material produced. From the historical point of view, barring some of his chronological data and his "Sumerian" assumptions, these are the most satisfactory pages of the volume. We find certain epochs or the reigns of certain rulers quite fully described in some of the longer inscriptions, and have some valuable material for building a history of these oases in the early Babylonian period.

Some interesting facts appear in the examination of this work. On pp. 53 *sq.* we find a transliteration and translation of the Barrel Cyl. found in *Déc.*, 32, but are disappointed to discover that Radau stops just where Amiaud did years ago (in *Déc.*, pp. xxx and xxxi). On pp. 76–81 we have a long inscription of Eannatum, composed of several smaller inscriptions reproduced from Thureau-Dangin's work in *RA.*, IV, pp. pp. 124, 125; in l. 44, also in note at bottom of page, he reads ab-ba where the original plainly gives a-ba; l. 56 should be [an-ta-ġe-šuš]. Pp. 97–109 is almost a verbatim reproduction of Thureau-Dangin's transliteration and translation on the "Cone of Entemena" in *RA.*, IV, pp. 42–50. Pp. 131–40 reproduce the Lugalzaggisi document, of which Radau says (p. 131, n. 2): "Thureau-Dangin first gave a complete translation in *RS.*, 1897, pp. 263 *sqq.;*" this he closely follows. At the conclusion of this document he discusses the relation of the Semites to Babylonia, and concludes by saying that "the immigration of the Semites" into Babylonia must be set back as early as, or earlier than, 5000 B. C., when the Sumerian power began to decay (p. 149). In a further discussion of the same question (pp. 178–80) he concludes (against Hilprecht) that the Semites came, not from the north, but from the south, and last of all conquered the northern provinces of Babylonia.

On p. 211 Radau states that Gudea Cyl. B, xxiii, 19 (this should be xxiii, 5″) should be read, not dumu-ka, but dumu-sag, as in Stat. B, i, 1. The connections are not the same, and the original of Cyl. B shows plainly a KA. On pp. 215–20 we have a marvelous exhibition

of skill in manipulating consonants. This will be realized when we find: "Only so much is certain that Kengi = Sungir = Shumer = Girsu = Shirpurla." What will philologists think of this transformation? What can we not prove if such methods are allowable? On p. 239 we find a severe arraignment of Winckler's "most careless and illogical argument" regarding Dungi of Ur; the conclusions which both scholars reach are due in large part to the lack of the necessary data to prove their premises. The reproduction of Thureau-Dangin's treatment of the names of the months (in *RA.*, IV, 83, 84) is scarcely relevant to the theme.

The appendix, in which we find some facsimiles, transliterations, and translations of the inscriptions in the E. A. H. collection, is a welcome though small, contribution to cuneiform literature. It gives the book one feature of value to scholars familiar with the other material of this early period. Though largely in the nature of contract or record tablets, they give us historical data of value, both in the old and in the new Babylonian periods. Several of the former date from the reigns of Bur-Sin, Ur-Ba'u, and Dungi.

Radau has used prodigious industry and brought together a vast amount of material—all except the E. A. H. collection already published in other works—and has classified it according to the periods to which he would attribute it. The book has its value in that it is a kind or register of early Babylonian texts. Scholars will, of course, use their own judgment regarding his chronological scheme. One thing is apparent throughout the work, viz., that he, like other "Sumerian" adherents, is having increasing difficulty in explaining the very early presence and power of the Semites in Babylonia.

It is not surprising if among the hundreds of references there should be some errors. We have noted the following, in addition to those already named: p. 15, second line, *Déc.*, 31, 3, should be *RA.*, II, p. 82; ninth line from bottom, *RA.*, III, should be IV; p. 16, ninth line from bottom, 70 should be 71; p. 27, l. 14, *RA.*, IV, should be III; p. 28, l. 10, same error; p. 81, l. 4 from bottom, $F^3$ should be $F^2$; p. 91, l. 3 from bottom, 281 should be 288; p. 191, l. 11 from bottom, should read Cyl. B, etc. Then, "Clercq," "le Clercq," occurring scores of times, should always be "de Clercq;" and "De Sarzec" should be "de Sarzec;" while titles of books would always appear more conspicuous and in better form if they were printed in italics. The author's English sometimes suffers from lack of familiarity with our idioms.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO. IRA M. PRICE.

---

## BROCKELMANN'S HISTORY OF ARABIC LITERATURE.[1]

This is not a history of Arabic literature, but it is an excellent contribution toward such a history. Dr. Brockelmann is a worthy successor of the lamented Wüstenfeld and has taken up his self-sacrificing labors

[1] GESCHICHTE DER ARABISCHEN LITTERATUR. Von Carl Brockelmann. I. Band. Weimar: *Verlag von Emil Felber*, 1898. xii + 528 pp.